

REMARKS

In this Preliminary Amendment, the specification is amended to more clearly specify the use of the tables described on pages 25 and 26 of the specification in the context of Fig. 4 of the present invention.

The Examiner had issued a final action in the parent case on October 6, 1992. In such Official action, the Examiner objected to the drawings; rejected the specification under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph; rejected claims 1-4, 6 and 7-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph; rejected claims 1, 2, 7, 8 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b); rejected claims 3, 6, 10 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e); and rejected claims 4 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Each of the Examiner's objections and rejections from the parent application is addressed below.

Objection to the Drawings and Specification

The Examiner objected to the drawings and specification as not showing claimed features of the present invention.

As mentioned above, Applicant has amended the specification to more clearly specify the use of the data by the processing modules to apply the example system discussed on pages 25 and 26 of the specification. It is believed that this will more clearly specify how the modules, which are claimed in the present invention, are interconnected. This amendment also will enable the Examiner to recognize the components of the invention which are shown in the Figures and how they are interconnected.

No new matter has been added, as the added text merely clarifies existing disclosure.

Thus, reconsideration of the objection to the drawings and the specification under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, is requested.

08925828-090597
465060" 82852680

[illegible]

Rejection of Claims 1, 2, 7, 8 and 9 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Accordingly, reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1, 2, 7, 8 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) is respectfully requested.

The Examiner rejected claims 3, 6, 10 and 13 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Morgan. It is believed that upon better understanding of the claims in view of the amendments set out above, the Examiner should withdraw this rejection. The Morgan reference cited by the Examiner has no connection with finding video after it has already been stored in a database. Rather it is only concerned with positioning a camera and controlling a camera position to shoot a particular image. Thus, reconsideration of the rejection based on Morgan is requested.

The Examiner rejected claims 4 and 11 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as obvious in light of Morgan and the Toshiba robotics paper. It is submitted that these claims clearly distinguish

over the combination of references for the same reason as there base claims distinguish over Morgan. Accordingly, reconsideration is requested.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is now in form for allowance. No new matter has been added to the present application, as Applicant has merely clarified the description already present.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: Jan. 6, 1993

By: Mark A. Haynes
Mark A. Haynes
Reg. No. 30,846

FLIESLER, DUBB, MEYER & LOVEJOY
Four Embarcadero Center, Suite 400
San Francisco, California 94111-4156
Telephone: (415) 362-3800